

REMARKS

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 3-6, 8-14, 17-22, 24-29, and 32-42 are currently pending
- Claims 2, 7, 15, 16, 23, 30, and 31 were previously canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein
- Claims 39 and 40 were previously withdrawn while preserving the right to incorporate the subject matter recited therein in subsequent continuation or divisional applications
- Claims 1, 14, 22, 29, and 41 are amended herein

[0005] Support for the claim amendments to Claims 1, 14, 22, 29, and 41 is found in the specification in at least paragraphs [0037], [0042], [0043], [0045], and [0048]. No new matter has been added.

Cited Documents

[0006] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- AAPA: Applicant Admitted Prior Art, Brumme et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0172286
- Muhlestein: Muhlestein et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0004815

- Muhl ‘102: Muhlestein et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0108102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-14, 17, 19-22, 24, 26-29, 32, 34-38, 41, and 42 are Non-Obvious over AAPA in view of Muhlestein

[0007] Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-14, 17, 19-22, 24, 26-29, 32, 34-38, 41, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over AAPA in view of Muhlestein. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. However, in spite of Applicant's traversal, without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claims 1, 14, 22, 29, and 41 in the manner set forth above.

Independent Claim 1

[0008] For at least the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that the above combination of references neither teaches nor suggests at least the following features recited in independent Claim 1:

preventing, by the computing device, calls from one of a plurality of managed code callers to the first method due to the first method's inappropriateness for the virtual machine environment, the first method's inappropriateness being indicated by a query that determines whether a host protection custom attribute (HPCA) is associated with the first method, the query determining from the HPCA that the calls from one of the plurality of managed code callers are to be prevented when the HPCA is associated with the first method; and

conditionally authorizing, by the computing device, calls from one of a plurality of managed code callers to the first method based on the first method's required level of trust, a level of trust attributed to the first managed code caller, and a rule demand that contains data quantifying a degree of the level of trust, the level of trust attributed to the first managed

code caller corresponding to an identity of a provider of the first managed code caller.

More particularly, Applicant respectfully submits that neither AAPA nor Muhlestein teach or suggest “preventing..., the first method’s inappropriateness being indicated by a query that determines whether a host protection custom attribute (HPCA) is associated with the first method, the query determining from the HPCA that the calls from one of the plurality of managed code callers are to be prevented when the HPCA is associated with the first method,” as presently recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added). Further, it is respectfully noted that the above underlined recitation is new and, therefore, has not been officially rejected. Moreover, Applicant submits that both AAPA and Muhlestein are completely silent with respect to the foregoing recitation. Accordingly, for at least the above reason, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of AAPA and Muhlestein.

[0009] In addition, Applicant further submits that the Examiner cited portions of AAPA and Muhlestein fail to teach or suggest “conditionally authorizing...calls from one of a plurality of managed code callers to the first method based on...a rule demand that contains data quantifying a degree of the level of trust,” as presently recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added). Although the Action asserts that Muhlestein teaches “the conditional allowance is based upon the first method’s required level of trust and a level of trust attributed to the first managed code caller” (Office Action, p. 5), Applicant has reviewed the Muhlestein reference and submits that Muhlestein simply fails to teach or suggest the recited “a rule demand that contains data quantifying a degree of the level of trust.” Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is patentable over AAPA and Muhlestein, both singularly and in

combination with one another.

Independent Claims 14, 22, 29, and 41

[0010] Independent Claims 14, 22, 29, and 41 recite features similar to those discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 14, 22, 29, and 41 are also patentable over AAPA and Muhlestein, both singularly and in combination with one another, for at least the reasons set forth above.

Dependent Claims 3-6, 8-13, 17-21, 24-28, 32-40, and 42

[0011] As stated above, independent Claims 1, 14, 22, and 29 are patentable over AAPA in view of Muhlestein. Accordingly, dependent Claims 3-6, 8-13, 17-21, 24-28, 32-40, and 42 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 14, 22, and 29, as well as for the additional features that Claims 3-6, 8-13, 17-21, 24-28, 32-40, and 42 recite.

Claims 4, 18, 25, and 33 are Non-Obvious over AAPA in view of Muhlestein, in further view of Muhl '102

[0012] Claims 4, 18, 25, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over AAPA in view of Muhlestein, in further view of Muhl '102. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0013] As stated above, independent Claims 1, 14, 22, and 29 are patentable over AAPA in view of Muhlestein. Furthermore, Muhl '102 neither remedies the deficiencies in AAPA and Muhlestein noted above with respect to independent Claims 1, 14, 22, and

29, nor does the rejection make any arguments to that effect. As a result, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent Claims 1, 14, 22, and 29 are patentable over AAPA, Muhlestein, and Muhl ‘102, both singularly and in combination with one another. Accordingly, dependent Claims 4, 18, 25, and 33 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 14, 22, and 29, as well as for the additional features that each claim recites.

[0014] Thus, AAPA, Muhlestein, and Muhl ‘102, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest the recitations of independent Claims 1, 14, 22, 29, and 41. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 14, 22, 29, and 41 are patentable over the proposed combination of references. Furthermore, dependent Claims 3-6, 8-13, 17-21, 24-28, 32-40, and 42 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 14, 22, and 29, as well as for the additional features that each claim recites. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

[0015] Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3-6, 8-14, 17-22, 24-29, and 32-42 are not obvious over the various combinations of AAPA, Muhlestein, and Muhl ‘102, and therefore, the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

[0016] For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 3-6, 8-14, 17-22, 24-29, and 32-42 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

[0017] The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action and because Applicant earnestly believed that the claims were in condition for allowance at the time of filing the previous response. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Brett J. Schlameus/ _____ Dated: 8/6/2009
Brett J. Schlameus (brett@leehayes.com; 206-876-6022)
Registration No. 60827

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826